

**Appl. No.** : **10/712,388**  
**Filed** : **November 12, 2003**

### **REMARKS**

In response to the Final Office Action mailed on May 31, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application. Prior to this amendment, Claims 1-6 and 13-19 were pending, with Claims 7-12 and 20 withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner. Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 5-13 and cancelled claim 20. Thus, after amendments, Claims 1-19 are pending. Applicants believe that Claims 1-19 are allowable.

### **SUMMARY OF JULY 19, 2006 INTERVIEW**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the July 19, 2006 telephonic interview. Applicants have received the Examiner's Interview Summary and make the following summary of the substance of the interview pursuant to M.P.E.P. 713.04:

- (A) No exhibits were shown, and no demonstration was conducted.
- (B) Claims 1, 7 and 13 were discussed.
- (C) The Trummer (US 6,354,477) and Chen (US 5,960,952) references were discussed. Applicants provided reasons why neither of these references individually or in combination teach or suggest the claimed inventions.
- (D) Applicants proposed amending Claims 1, 7 and 13. Applicants proposed amending Claim 13 by providing four straps to the inventive device, as noted by the Examiner. With respect to Claims 1 and 7, Applicants proposed amending those claims by providing straps to the inventive device.
- (E) Applicants explained why Claims 1, 7 and 13 should be allowable over the prior art and also why these claims would be allowable if amended to recite straps.
- (F) Applicants pointed out that the Examiner's §102 rejections were inconsistent with the §103 rejections. The Examiner clarified that the §102 rejections were inadvertently included in the Final Office Action as a left-over from previous non-final Office Action. Thus, the Examiner informed Applicant that they should disregard paragraphs 2-4 of the Final Office Action.

Appl. No. : 10/712,388  
Filed : November 12, 2003

(G) No allowable language was agreed upon. Applicants informed the Examiner that they would be filing the instant Request for Continued Examination.

### **COMMENTS**

#### **Election/Restrictions**

The Examiner withdrew from consideration Claims 7-12 (amended from apparatus claims to method claims) as being drawn to a non-elected invention. Applicants have amended Claims 7-12 to be apparatus claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

#### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

With respect to the various prior art rejections, Applicants respectfully disagree with them in terms of the teachings of the cited art and the lack of any suggestion or motivation to modify or combine the references. Applicants have previously furnished some of its arguments of the deficiencies of the prior art teachings.

Applicants have amended Claims 1, 7 and 13 to recite "strap." Claim 1 was amended to recite a "first" and "second" "strap," each "having an adjustable length with sufficient length to encircle at least a portion of a car seat," and each "comprising a strap portion attached substantially near an edge of the upper apex." Claim 7 was amended to recite a "first" and a "second" "strap," each "having an adjustable length with sufficient length to encircle at least a portion of a car seat," and each "comprising a strap portion attached substantially near a corner of the apparatus." Claim 13 was amended to recite "four straps."

None of the prior art, either individually or in any combination, teaches or suggests such straps as recited in independent Claims 1, 7 and 13.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully request the same. Furthermore, any remarks in support of patentability of one claim should not be imputed to any other claim, even if similar terminology is used. Although changes to the claims have been made, no acquiescence or estoppel is or should be implied thereby; such changes are made only to expedite prosecution of the present application and are

Appl. No. : 10/712,388  
Filed : November 12, 2003

without prejudice to the presentation or assertion, in the future, of claims relating to the same or similar subject matter. If, however, some issue remains that the Examiner feels can be addressed by an Examiner's Amendment or if the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be clarified with a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned to discuss.


Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: July 31, 2006

By:

  
Irfan A. Lateef  
Registration No. 51,922  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(949) 760-0404

2784419  
072606